DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 756 HE 017 615

AUTHOR Mason, Thomas R.
TITLE The Search for Quality in the Face of Retrenchment: Planning for Program Consolidation within Resource Capacities.
PUB DATE 10 Jul 84
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Conference of the Society for College and University Planning (19th, Cambridge, MA, July 10, 1984).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration; *College Planning; *Declining Enrollment; Economic Climate; *Educational Quality; Faculty Evaluation; *Financial Problems; Higher Education; Institutional Evaluation; Outcomes of Education; *Program Evaluation; Reputation; *Retrenchment
IDENTIFIERS Program Discontinuance; *Strategic Planning; University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT

Planning issues for colleges seeking to maintain quality in institutional programs in the face of retrenchment are analyzed, based on a literature review. An extensive bibliography on the following topics is provided: quality (ratings, rankings, reform, institutional goals, and educational outcomes); retrenchment (enrollment decline, faculty, finances, and flexibility); evaluation (assessment of performance); and strategic planning and other solutions. Specific concerns that are analyzed in the paper and covered in the bibliography include: reputational ratings of institutional quality, criticisms of educational quality, proposals for reform, attempts to catalog definitions of institutional goals and performance of these goals through measures of educational outcomes, the decline in high school graduates and the 18-24 age group, declines in states revenues associated with economic recession, reduction of federal program funding combined with inflation exceeding revenue, a planning approach implemented at the University of Minnesota as an example of the successful use of retrenchment to achieve positive goals and the decisionmaking criteria involved, the importance of evaluation to help justify priorities, and strategic planning versus the more traditional forms of long-range planning. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE SEARCH FOR QUALITY IN THE FACE OF RETRENCHMENT:
Planning for Program Consolidation within Resource Capacities

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas R. Mason

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Thomas R. Mason
MIRA Incorporated

19th Annual International Conference
The Society for College and University Planning
Cambridge, Massachusetts, July 10, 1984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED248756

HE 017 615

Quality. Retrenchment. Evaluation. Strategic Planning. Those are recurrent themes in the literature of higher education over the past decade.

In 1982 the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges published The Coming Enrollment Crisis: What Every Trustee Must Know by David W. Breneman, then of the Brookings Institution. Anticipating that U.S. postsecondary enrollments will drop at least 15 percent in the coming decade, Breneman concludes his assessment with this statement:

> The challenge now is not just to survive, but to do so while enhancing the quality of instruction, research, and public service rendered by the institution during a time of general retrenchment (Breneman, 1982, p. 36).

Signs of declining quality of education at all levels attract increasing public concern. The debate on ways of measuring, judging, and improving educational quality continues.

Retrenchment of budgets and programs is intensified by the recent economic recession and its impacts on state resources, by actual and anticipated reduction of federal funding of higher education programs in various forms, and by increased dependence on tuition income. Demographic projections demonstrate the decrease of the traditional college-age population; prospects of declining enrollments in the next decade accentuate the probability of retrenchment in higher education.

More effective and thorough evaluation of educational programs increasingly is demanded, both to determine program priorities for reduction and to improve quality of remaining programs.

Better ways of planning are being sought to support college and university leadership in "taking charge of change" to balance institutional program scope with resource capacities toward improved program quality. Strategic planning has become the popular answer in the past few years. What does strategic planning mean? Is it replacing — or supplementing — the more traditional forms of long-range planning?

The recent literature on issues of quality, retrenchment, and evaluation suggest the kinds of planning analyses and institutional research studies needed to aid college and university decision processes to sustain and improve quality of institutional programs in the face of retrenchment. This paper provides an extensive bibliography on these higher education planning issues and selectively discusses ideas in that literature I find most useful.

Multitudes of questions emerge during institutional program evaluation and resource capacity assessment:

1. How are the environments of the institution changing? What impacts are these changes likely to have on enrollments, on funding resources, on program operating costs? Are changes in the missions of the institution or particular program goals and objectives needed to respond to the changing environment?

2. How will the institution be affected in the next decade by the declining college-age population? Will enrollment changes have different impacts on particular programs and levels of instruction? How can the institution best respond to increasing competition for students? Can new enrollment markets be found to replace decreasing numbers of students from traditional sources?

3. What are the revenue prospects from various funding sources? How can a reasonable stability be achieved between funding resources, enrollments, program offerings, faculty sizes, facilities requirements?

4. Relative to their costs, how do the various programs contribute to the productive indicators of the institution — such as student credit hours produced, services to other programs, degrees granted, research and scholarship published, public services performed?

5. What are the committed obligations to maintain a given program — such as tenured faculty, institutional traditions, student demand, and services to other programs? Can these commitments be changed?

6. What are the current and prospective facilities capacities of the institution relative to program loads? Will it be necessary, feasible, and desirable to convert some facilities to income-producing uses, to sell them, or to mothball some buildings until the moderate enrollment rise expected in the late 1990's?

7. How will the new technologies in computing, information systems, and satellite communications affect the various instruction, research, and service programs, including libraries?

8. What approaches can the institution best take to plan for adaptation to possible retrenchment? Can faculty task forces be joined with external expertise to evaluate the qualities and deficiencies of particular programs? How will the decision processes be organized toward making, implementing, and guiding these changes?

9. Can institutional and program goals and objectives be defined in sufficiently specific and operational form so that performance can be more objectively measured and judgmentally evaluated?

10. What does <u>quality</u> mean in the context of a particular planning issue? What indicators of quality are available? Who should make judgments about quality in a specific case?

1. Quality

Quality is a characteristic or attribute. Its use implies a graded scale of degrees of quality ranging from poor to excellent, bad to good, inferior to superior, low to high, ineffective to effective, zero to ten. Qualities of physical entities often are objectively measureable in terms of degree of fineness, purity, strength, durability. Qualities of human enterprises such as education generally are recognized as essentially subjective, matters of judgment. Peer review is the accepted form of quality assessment in higher education. Determination of the degree of quality generally involves comparison with other entities of similar kind or classification. Comparative reputational rankings of institutional programs, although subject to much criticism, serve to identify the models of high quality and to suggest the conditions required for higher quality.

In the bibliography, I have divided the references on quality into two categories:

1A. Quality: Ratings, Rankings, and Reform covering the general discussion of issues of quality in higher education, reputational ratings of institutional quality, criticisms of educational quality, and proposals for reform; and

1B. Quality: Institutional Goals and Educational Outcomes dealing with attempts to catalog definitions of institutional goals and performance of these goals through measures of educational outcomes.

If I were asked to recommend one of the more than 50 entries in the attached bibliography on the complex question of quality, I choose the 1980 AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research report by Judith K. Lawrence and Kenneth C. Green, A Question of Quality: The Higher Education Ratings Game. An excellent bibliographic review, the commentary provides a summary of alternative approaches to the assessment of quality. Lawrence and Green (p. 3) find general consensus on the following needs:

> 1. If comparisons must be made, they should be made between similar types of institutions, at the same level, in the same disciplines....
>
> 2. Quality assessments must identify program goals and objectives and be referenced to them.
>
> 3. Quality assessments must be based on a variety of attributes.
>
> 4. The meaning of "quality" is — and should be — as varied as the purposes behind an assessment, the measurement criteria used, and the group or groups conducting the assessment; herein lie the value and limitations of quality assessments.
>
> 5. The teaching-learning function of higher education has been virtually ignored in quality assessments. Conceptually and methodologically, the value-added, input-environment-output model merits further investigation.

In their conclusions, Lawrence and Green place definition of program goals and objectives as the first necessity:

> ...Quality assessments must be referenced to departmental or institutional goals and objectives. Although academics may find it hard to agree on the proper goals and objectives of higher education, some specification of desired outcomes is required as a first step in the assessment process (p. 53).

A goal is the preferred result from an effort, the desired outcome of an experience, an intended set of values added to a participant in a process. Desired outcomes of a particular degree program or a specific instructional course, presumably, are always implied, if not explicitly or clearly defined in the catalog, course description, or syllabus. Most often, the intention of a single specific course is understood but not precisely defined. The much more complex patterns of institutional goals typically are broad, general statements of institutional purpose and mission not readily measurable.

Lawrence and Green stress that "more attention should be paid to the 'value-added' concept of higher education."

> To give an institution or a program high marks for the resources it is able to attract, without regard for what it does with those resources, is surely to overlook the whole purpose of education at any level: to bring about certain desired changes in students. Before we can judge how well an institution does with and by its students, we must know what the students were like at college entry. The input-environment-outcome model is a conceptual tools whereby the characteristics of entering students can be taken into account to arrive at an assessment of the impact of the college experience itself. Such an approach is especially necessary in a period when the twin doctrines of entitlement and equal educational opportunity are espoused as worthy social goals (p. 54).

During the 1960s, as the concepts and vocabulary of program budgeting were being applied to higher education, the term outcome was adopted in preference to output borrowed from productivity and cost-benefit models. Defining the outcomes of postsecondary education and their measurement became a central effort of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (Micek and Wallhaus, 1973; Micek and Arney, 1974; Wallhaus, 1975; Lenning, Lee, Micek, and Service, 1977; Lenning, 1977). Given the complexity of all institutional outcomes categories, the emphasis in the NCHEMS program evolved toward student outcomes questionnaires jointly developed with The College Board (Gray, Jacobson, Micek, Patrick, Renkiewicz, and Van Dusen, 1979).

NCHEMS also developed a related program for Measures of Institutional Goal Achievement (Romney and Micek, 1977; Romney, 1978; Fenske, 1978). The Educational Testing Service undertook development of the Institutional Goals Inventory (Peterson and Uhl, 1972, 1975, 1977).

All of these sources provide extensive lists of goals and outcomes that may be adapted to a particular institution or program. I particularly recommend Leonard C. Romney, Measures of Institutional Goal Achievement (1978); Oscar T. Lenning, The Outcomes Structure: An Overview for Applying It In Postsecondary Education Institutions (1977); and Richard E. Peterson and Normal Uhl, College and University Goals: A Guide for Using the IGI (1977).

2A. Retrenchment: Enrollment Decline

The 18-24 age group doubled from 15 million in 1955 to over 30.3 million in 1980. Total higher education enrollments, with expanding participation, more than quadrupled, increasing from 2.6 million in 1955 to 12.1 million in 1980. The number of births in the U.S. dropped from 4.3 million in the peak baby boom year 1957 to a low point of 3.1 million in 1973. For the past decade, each institution has faced the question of what impacts that decrease will have on its future enrollments.

The demographic decrease in the 18-24 age group now has begun. Although the 18-24 age group reached nearly 30.5 million in 1981, the Census estimate for November 1984 is below 29 million, a drop of 1.5 million in three years (Census, April 1984). Just arrived last week, the new Projections of the Population of the United States by Age, Sex, and Race: 1983 to 2080 provides the latest evidence, with much extended forecasts covering the next century. In the middle series of these latest projections, the 18-24 population is expected to decline to under 23.3 million by 1996, a drop of 7.2 million (23.7%) from its 1981 peak (Census, May 1984).

As the products of the baby boom reached young adulthood in the late 1970s, the number of births went back up to 3.7 million per year. Although the birthrate in the past ten years has been 60 percent that of the 1950s, the child-bearing population group is two-thirds larger than it was then. The baby boom generation has produced a moderate new baby boom in the late 1970s that (compounded by the growing proportion of working mothers) has greatly increased demand for preschool day care. Now, elementary school enrollments are reviving. The increase will begin reaching college-age in the mid-1990s. By 2010, the 18-24 age group will recover to over 27.6 million -- still 9 percent below 1981 — followed by a slow decrease to 25.3 million by 2080, 17 percent below the 1981 peak (Census, May 1984).

The total number of high school graduates reached its peak of just over 3.1 million between 1975 and 1978 and began to decrease, but a combination of expanding participation and economic recession have kept higher education enrollments at 12 million. The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education projections of high school graduates by state, recently updated and extended to the year 2000, show a drop from over 2.9 million high school graduates in 1980-81 to a low of under 2.3 million in 1992-93, then a rise to nearly 2.7 million by 2000 (McConnell and Kaufman, 1984, updating McConnell, 1979).

In spite of the decline in high school graduates and the 18-24 age group in the past few years, college enrollments have held up in most institutions and increased in some. This largely is attributable to the recent recession and higher unemployment rates. With the end of the recession, community colleges (the most sensitive to employment conditions) dropped 0.5 percent between 1982-83 and 1983-84 (Chronicle, May 23, 1984). Other enrollment signals for Fall 1984 currently are mixed, with increases in applications possibly attributable to individuals filing multiple applications with more institutions (Chronicle, April 4, 1984).

The drop in the birthrate and its forthcoming impact on college enrollments has been constantly discussed in the councils and media of higher education over the past decade, but many institutions seemed to continue assuming that they can hold their enrollments steady. In the mid-1970s Allan Cartter and others were criticizing the apparent short-sightedness of higher education in not planning for the demographic disequilibrium (Cartter, 1975, 1976). The National Institute of Education in 1978 published a report on Declining Enrollments: The Challenge of the Coming Decade covering all levels of education. Publication in 1979 by WICHE of McConnell's projections of high school graduates in the 50 states to 1995 precipitated more attention (McConnell, 1979). This was followed in 1980 by the publication of Three Thousand Futures by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies, warning that in the next 20 years declining enrollments are the most dramatic issue facing colleges and universities and emphasizing that each institution will be uniquely affected.

To respond to the growing concern, the American Council on Education joined the National Center for Educational Statistics for an enrollment trend study and an analysis of potential options to offset decreased traditional enrollments. Using enrollment data from the National Center for Educational Statistic (NCES) and the Bureau of the Census, a special Joint ACE-NCES Project on Enrollment Trends forecast that the 18-24 age group will drop 14.3 percent (4.3 million) from 1980 to 1990. Assuming a constant college-going rate of 25.3 percent, this projects a 14.6 percent decline of 1,092,000 in the 18-24 age group enrolled in college and results in a 9.2 percent drop in total enrollment at all ages and in full-time equivalent students. Twelve alternative strategies are listed in the ACE report as "possible offsets." Three are called "national strategies" to increase college-going rates of lower and middle income youth and adults aged 35-64 and the numbers of foreign students. The ACE study projects that these options in combination would add up by 1990 to 301,000 more full-time equivalent students than in 1980, an increase of 3.5 percent over 1980 FTE total enrollment (Frances, 1980b).

The combination of options in the ACE report that projected the possibility that enrollments might actually gain by 3.5 percent in 1990 over 1980 was picked up by the press, largely ignoring the qualifications, and was widely publicized. The ACE report was criticized for appealing to the urge of higher education administrators to wear rose-colored glasses on the enrollment decline issue. Change magazine picked up the issue. Under the title, Preparing for the 1980s, Change published side-by-side an article by Fred E. Crossland of the Ford Foundation attacking the ACE report and a response from Carol Frances, its principal author.

Crossland (1980) warns in "Learning to Cope with the Downward Slope" that the ACE report "may be counterproductive by shielding administrators from reality and delaying sensible planning" (pp. 18 and 20). He uses the McConnell (1979) high school graduate projections and their regional subsets to show the heavier impact of decrease in the northeast and north central states, the lesser impact on the sunbelt states. Crossland emphasizes that enrollment decline prospects must be directly confronted. He develops a hypothetical model of a state's enrollment outlook to illustrate his belief that the public state colleges (formerly state teachers' colleges) and non-prestigious private colleges are likely to be most acutely impacted.

In response to Crossland, titled "Apocalyptic vs. Strategic Planning," Frances summarizes the forthcoming full ACE report on college enrollment and attacks the Crossland approach as the management of decline. "If you plan, manage, and budget for decline, that is precisely what you will get" (Frances, 1980a, p. 39). An alternative approach is advocated: "By encompassing analysis of more possible outcomes, while including retrenchment among the other prospects, it cuts the risk-and cost-of being wrong" (p. 19). Frances argues that strategic planning provides "identification and careful assessment of the possible outcomes of strategies for offsetting the projected declines" (p. 40).

The ACE report probably did encourage college and university administrators to defer the unpleasant task of direct attack on the prospect of decreasing enrollments. A 1981 survey of college presidents by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA found that 42 percent expect increases in enrollment by 1986, only 16 percent expect declines (Baldridge, Kemerer, and Green, 1982). Robert L. Gale, President of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, writes:

> After looking at statistics on the drop-off in high school graduates for the coming years, I took an informal survey to see how presidents were planning for the decline. Much to my surprise, I found that almost every chief executive queried felt his or her institution would maintain enrollments in a stable pattern for the next 10 years. A few presidents mentioned that they dare not say anything to the contrary, for fear it would become a self-fulfilling prophecy (Breneman, 1982, p. 4).

Because the most optimistic projected option in ACE report had received the most publicity, the Association of Governing Boards invited David Breneman of the Brookings Institution to take "a fresh look at the facts and issues, coupled with realistic interpretation." His study was published in 1982 as The Coming Enrollment Crisis: What Every Trustee Must Know.

Distributed to governing board members of most U.S. institutions, Breneman's assessment of the demographic prospects of enrollment decline (pp. 8-13) is based primarily on the projections of high school graduates by McConnell (1979). He reviews (pp. 13-21) the possible offsets to the demographic decline described in Frances (1980b) and cautions against overly optimistic expectations "that each college will find some combination of nontraditional students to offset the loss of the traditional college-age population" because many of the strategies outlined are outside the power of an institution to control. Other factors -- the economy, student aid, inflation, employment prospects, various aspects of institutional attactiveness) that influence enrollments, and increasing competition — are listed and generally described as uncertain (pp. 22-25).

After examining the "Prospects for the Sectors of Higher Education" relating to different types and sizes of institutions (pp. 26-29), Breneman poses a series of "Questions Trustees Might Ask" that provide a useful agenda of the kinds of institutional research and planning studies needed to prepare answers. Breneman warns that the answers will "require significant amounts of staff time for research and investigation, and virtually all the questions assume that the college or university has an adequate management-information system on which the draw" (Breneman, 1982, p. 30).

At the same time as the Breneman report, Baldridge, Kemerer, and Green prepared an extensive bibliographic review and summary of the literature associated with the prospective enrollment decline for the ERIC/AAHE research report series for 1982. The report, The Enrollment Crisis: Factors, Actors, and Impacts, finds that there is extensive concern about enrollments, that the impacts will vary widely among types of institutions and locations, that cuts in government financial aid programs is the major negative concern, and that colleges have done little to prepare for the prospective program retrenchment. "Points of Leverage" are described for recuitment and admissions (pp. 27-34) and student retention (pp. 35-44). The closing chapter (pp. 45-60) is especially useful in identifying planning and institutional research studies needed to develop responsive planning strategy for a campus. "As we move into a period of genuine uncertainty, the sophistication of management information systems and the expertise of planning staff must be sharply intensified" (p. 46).

2B. Retrenchment: Faculty, Finances, Flexibility

To retrench means to cut down, reduce, diminish, curtail. Its common usage implies contraction of resources, economizing, reducing expenditures. Retrenchment is a harsh word, especially in higher education, which is addicted to growth: Between 1955 and 1975 in the U.S., enrollments quadrupled, direct expenditures increased 10-fold from $3.5 billion to $35 billion (five-fold in constant dollars), and programs greatly expanded in number and scope.

In the late 1960s, there was growing awareness of the implications of decline in the birthrate since 1960 and of impending financial stress in many colleges and universities. The end of expansion was sharply dramatized in 1971 by the title of the book by Earl F. Cheit, The New Depression in Higher Education. From a study of 41 institutions, Cheit found that nearly three-fourths were in or near financial difficulty, defined as resources being inadequate to sustain mission and standards of quality (Cheit, 1971, p. 36).

By 1975, in his introduction to Assuring Academic Progress Without Growth, Allan M. Cartter could observe:

> In the 1960s higher education was called upon to respond to acceleration and growth; in the 1970s and 1980s it will have to respond to deceleration and possible contraction. The resilience of higher education is tested in both situations. They are not symmetrical, however, for fixed plant and tenured faculty make contraction a much slower and more difficult process than expansion. Growth rewards creative opportunism — it provides educational administrators with an opportunity to place their personal stamp on an educational organization, and it also tends to mask or correct errors of administrative judgment. Contraction, on the other hand, requires as individual and organizational attributes a certain toughness and self-discipline. Thus resilience requires different talents for different conditions. "The creative management of decline," as Hollander refers to it, is a different and more exacting task than creative leadership in a period of expansion (Cartter, 1975, pp. vii-vii).

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education reflected the rising threat to higher education quality in prescribing More Effective Use of Resources (1972). Balderston (1974, p. 182) described five models of financial stress: expanded academic aspiration, time passing, stabilization after growth, conscientious overcommitment, and income tapering. He forecast that most institutions would continue to grow or stabilize in the 1970s, but then would have to consider "how to plan the withdrawal of resources from each domain of the institution's activity" (p. 198).

Howard R. Bowen summarizes the up and down cycles of higher education as follows:

> Following World War II, the nation entered a manic phase which lasted through most of the 1960s. During this time, higher education was seen as the key to individual opportunity, social advancement, and world power. As a result, it attained a wholly new level of financial support and expanded to a previously unheard of scale of operation. But following the late 1960s, we entered the depressive phase of the cycle. People began to sense that higher education had not brought on the millennium and had not solved as the problems of individuals or of society. They were upset about the student unrest of the 1960s. They became concerned as to whether we were trying to educate more students than were qualified for college work, they questioned whether the labor market could supply enough jobs for all the college graduates, and they worried about the ever-increasing cost of the higher education establishment (Bowen, 1978, p. 25).

Reviewing the more positive indicators, Bowen declares that "Higher Education is clearly well worth the resources it uses" (1978, p. 27). He concludes that

> ...American higher education is robust, vigorous, productive, and useful and that it has much work to do in the future.... But I would not want to leave you with the impression that I think it is perfect or even as good as it should be.... People are aware of problems and trying to do something about them. Overall, the evidence is overwhelming that American higher education is a thriving industry with a potentially bright, even though uncertain, future (p. 32).

Despite Bowen's positive assessment, the gloom of retrenchment deepened in 1981 with significant drops in state revenues associated with economic recession, compounded by prospective enrollment decline, reduction of federal program funding, and the recent acute inflation outrunning revenue. This year, Bowen again calls for a more positive outlook in an article in the April 1984 Change titled "What's Ahead for Higher Education? Opportunities for Optimism." Bowen questions "the current forecasts that are presented so positively and the current fashion of strategic planning." He finds that the history of the past fifty years "suggests that academic administration consists not of long-range planning based on reliable predictions, but of adjustment to a continual succession of surprises" (p. 9, italics added.) He then lists a variety of signs that offer more optimistic possibilities that affirm "that the American people are not going to stand by idly and watch the carefully fashioned educational institutions of our society, built with great effort and sacrifice, disintegrate" (p. 13).

> In looking toward the future, which is always inscrutable, I believe one should not try to achieve a single forecast but rather should try to judge the range of possibilities, which is always very wide. This approach avoids the great danger of self-fulfilling prophecies, and also, of colossal errors. I would add that there is an underlying stability to higher education.... The educator will be right if he assumes that higher education in the next decade will be very like that in the present decade (Bowen, 1984, p. 13).

Many institutions over the past few years have been actively and painfully engaged in various forms of retrenchment. Among those I have observed, the University of Minnesota experience demonstrates what seems to be successful use of retrenchment to improve program effectiveness, efficiency, and quality.

The University of Minnesota initiated a new planning approach in 1975 with the formation of a Planning Council by the new President, C. Peter Magrath. Extended deliberations by the Planning Council produced a series of issue/action papers concentrated on organization and staffing of planning. In the Fall of 1978, an "architecture for all-University planning process" was proposed. In the spring of 1979 all units were requested to submit statements of mission, goals and objectives of their programs, and a President's Working Group was formed to review and evaluate them. Given the prospects of approaching undergraduate enrollment decreases and changes in educational program demand patterns, there was much discussion of how to organize the planning process but little need for immediate substantive action (Linck and Heydinger, 1983).

Suddenly, in October 1981 the whole process got an unanticipated test when the State of Minnesota announced that it faced a $750 million budget deficit by the close of the 1981-83 biennium. The governor asked all state agencies to submit alternative retrenchment budgets for the biennium. When the legislature settled the reduced appropriations, the University had to cover a shortfall of $25.6 million. This brought integration of the planning and budgeting process. A Budget Executive was formed from executive officers to function as the principal planning authority. The phrase "reallocation and retrenchment" emerged as the theme. The program planning process focused on having the deans and directors identify programs of highest and lowest priorities, with expectation that "5 percent of their resources would be taken back centrally to meet retrenchment and 5 percent would be shifted from low to high priority needs within the unit" (Heydinger, c. 1982, p. 5).

In May 1982, the Budget Executive presented to the University of Minnesota Board of Regents a summary of Academic Program Priorities: The University's Choices for 1982-85. The following Decision-Making Criteria were used in reviewing the priorities proposed (Minnesota, 1982, pp. 2-3):

> Quality - Particularly in academic programs, it is difficult...to build quality in a conscious and deliberate way. Where it occurs, it is often the result of the happy combination of opportunity, good luck, and foresight. Thus, once a University has achieved a high level of quality in a program, it should make every effort to preserve it; and where an obvious opportunity exists to make a substantial improvement in quality with a realistic investment of resources, it should be taken.

Connectedness - This...refers to the extent to which the programs of a department or college serve other departments and colleges. Where this connectedness is high, it is unrealistic to consider extensive reductions in its activities unless alternative arrangements can be made to provide for the instruction or support activities.

Integration - The University's particular commitment to teaching, research, and service suggests that those programs that integrate all of those activities well are especially appropriate and important. In large part, this is because the University is committed to and responsible for both the generation and transmission of knowledge, and those activities are best stimulated and provided for in an atmosphere in which individual faculty and programs are committed to both.

Uniqueness - ...The University's land-grant mission suggests that where we have a unique and useful program, we should have a strong commitment to maintain it. However, in making this determination, it is also important to consider whether the program is appropriate to the University's role and strengths, and whether it could or should be offered elsewhere.

Demand - Demand is obviously an important factor, but we must be careful not to interpret it too narrowly. That is, we must avoid considering demand to be measured only by the number of students seeking admission to regular, full-time undergraduate or graduate programs. Part-time students and outreach audiences must also be considered in assessing demand and...the needs of employers for individuals trained in certain disciplines constitute a form of demand. Moreover, the demand for the other "products" of the University, such as its research contributions to the solution of pressing economic and social problems, and its contributions to the quality of life are equally valid issues to be considered in assessing this factor.

Cost-effectiveness - Whether in an era of growth or contraction, our aspirations are always limited by the resources available. Thus we must continually examine our programs to see if there are less costly ways to offer the same program or more efficient ways to accomplish the same ends. Yet cost alone must not govern our decisions, for the effectiveness of the program must also be weighed. When taken together, cost and effectiveness provide one important measure of whether we are putting our funds to best use.

Each college or division developed a program priorities statement proposing program changes for reduction or development for 1982-85. A few programs (such as dental assisting, the library school, and undergraduate metallurgy degree program) were proposed for elimination, but most of the retrenchment proposals were for reduction or reorganization. Spending cuts made up three-fourths of the shortfall, while "revenue enhancements (primarily in the form of a tuition increase) would cover the remainder of the shortfall" (Heydinger, c. 1982, p 8). My observation suggests that because the University of Minnesota started to discuss the pending need to plan for "retrenchment and reallocation" well before the actual crisis arrived, it was able to meet the 1981-82 cutbacks with less trauma than many others have experienced (for example, see Bunn, 1982).

Faculty reduction is the most traumatic aspect of retrenchment, given the critical value placed on tenure in American higher education. For faculty whose programs were designated for reduction or elimination, the University of Minnesota developed a "voluntary separation" program with options for separation pay equivalent to two years at full salary, phased retirement, or early retirement. This pattern, especially early retirement, is being repeated in many institutions, especially those who want to avoid declaring financial exigency to establish grounds for elimination of tenured positions.

Among the sources I find most useful for guidance in the face of retrenchment, I strongly recommend Gerlinda S. Melchiori, Planning for Program Discontinuance: From Default to Design (1982). This AAHE/ERIC research report not only is an excellent bibliographic commentary; it also provides explicit checklists and procedures and draws on Melchiori's own expertise on the University of Michigan retrenchment experience. The articles in Stephen R. Hample's 1981 issue of New Directions for Institutional Research, Coping with Faculty Reduction, provides additional retrenchment experience from several institutions. The complex legal issues associated with retrenchment and tenure are well documented in Robert M. Hendrickson and Barbara A. Lee, Academic Employment and Retrenchment: Judicial Review and Administrative Action (1983).

Although the recent recession invoked some severe immediate experience with retrenchment in crisis, the worst probably is yet to come. After the current drop in high school graduates, there is a slight resurgence in 1987 and 1988, then the precipitous drop below 2.3 million between 1991 and 1994 before the partial recovery begins (McConnell and Kaufman, 1984, p. 6). The 18-24 age group will hit bottom in 1996 before partly rebounding (Census, May 1984).

The probability of enrollment drops in most institutions is strongly founded on demographic facts of actual decreased births. Most of the offsetting options for expanding enrollments of nontraditional students are still guesswork. Planning for potential retrenchment and finding effective ways of moderating its negative impacts continues to be the critical agenda item for college and university planning.

I want to note how many references on the enrollment decline issue express fear of or cite as a danger the phenomenon of the self-fulfilling prophecy. I have always viewed that phenomenon as a positive value in planning. During the growth era I learned that carefully done forecasts guided by clearly defined goals and objectives on which reasonable consensus is developed do indeed become self-fulfilling prophecies of where the institution wants to go. With clear targets of institutional direction, multitudes of decisions -- major and minor -- are made on the assumption that the targets are desirable, and movement toward those targets is increasingly reinforced. When growth, program enrichment, and improved funding were involved, we wanted the prophecies to be fulfilled. Now, when contraction and retrenchment are expected (or threatened), the self-fulfilling prophecy has become an anathema! That suggests that the targets of improved quality, effectiveness, efficiency, and performance of programs are a vital part of planning for retrenchment. With Breneman, I say let's make the most of what appears to be an inescapable degree of retrenchment by planning for improved quality. If we can clearly define the terms for improving quality of programs (a big IF), the self-fulfilling prophecy can again become a virtue!

3. Evaluation: Assessment of Performance

Whether in the face of stability, growth, or retrenchment, vital processes in college and university governance are program evaluation, faculty evaluation, and assessment of program performance. Evaluation has taken on new significance and added strength because determination and justification of priorities is more necessary. The most firmly established and widely applied form of evaluation in U.S. higher education is accreditation. By this remarkable voluntary agreement, institutions submit their programs periodically to review and critical evaluation by peers drawn from outside the institution to certify that work in its academic programs is worthy of transfer to other institutions (see Harcleroad, 1980, and Millard, 1983).

Faculty evaluation, often formally organized but largely done through informal judgment, is an integral part of the administrative processes of determining qualification for reappointment, granting of tenure, judging merit for salary increases, and, now, selecting candidates for termination.

In the opening paragraph of his chapter on "Evaluating Program Performance" in the Jedamus, Peterson, and Associates handbook, Eugene C. Craven (1980, p. 432) writes:

> The basic challenge to academic institutions during the 1980 will be maintaining the quality of instructional programs while controlling and perhaps even reducing costs. Attendant to this dilemma is a series of problematic questions: How should declining resources be distributed to the instructional units within an institution — should all units share proportionally in cutbacks or should resource reductions be made selectively and, if so, on what basis? Regardless of program enrollment, what fixed resources must be available if a program is to be offered and its quality maintained? How can programs continue to be responsive to the needs of students, society, and scholarship? How can access for a broad socioeconomic range of students be maintained despite pressures to raise tuition and fees? And how can the intellectual vitality of the faculty be maintained when faculty are threatened with the prospect of layoffs?

I have found value in all of the more than 30 items under this heading in the appended bibliography. They are useful sources in designing the processes unique to each institution and to each situation requiring some form of evaluation. I will only note a few of my favorites.

With some prejudice, I find that the first issue in 1974 of New Directions for Institutional Research, Evaluating Institutions for Accountability, edited by Howard R. Bowen, to be a valued classic, along with Dressel (1961). The second of that series, Assessing Faculty Effort, edited by James I. Doi in 1974, also is a classic of that more special category. The bibliographic study of Whitman and Weiss, Faculty Evaluation: The Use of Explicit Criteria for Promotion, Retention, and Tenure (1982) outlines recent specific methods of faculty evaluation. Craven's work on program evaluation (1980), joined by the bibliographic assessment by Feasley (1980), are valuable references. The work of both Richard Miller (1979, 1981) and Richard Wilson (1980, 1984) on performance assessment are important contributions to the search for better ways of analyzing what programs actually achieve.

4. Strategic Planning — and Other Solutions

Strategic planning recently evoked a contribution to the editorial page of The Wall Street Journal (May 29, 1984) from Thomas V. DiBacco, a historian in the College of Business at American University, headed Abreast of the Biz School Buzzwords. Among his comments:

> In the old days you couldn't get a darn volunteer for the "Faculty Planning Committee" because everyone seemed to know that the best laid plans of professors go astray or wind up in the round file. On the other hand, strategic planning has "structural support" and "activity decision packages," the latter a real attraction since they're modeled along the lines of Cracker Jacks, with a little prize in every box. And to add cream to the rhetorical milk, the strategic planners rely on "key management personnel," which I'm certain can mean just about everyone from the dean down to the locksmith.

After further examination of the lingo of strategic planning, DiBacco pleads for a return to "the good ole days when the goals of professors were to 'teach,' 'research,' 'write,' 'steer students' and 'serve mankind.'"

Strategic planning, indeed, has become a buzz-word loaded with sophisticated-sounding terms; it now has the popularity of "program budgeting" fifteen years ago and "zero-based budgeting" ten years ago. The best evaluation I have seen of strategic planning applied to higher education is available to all members of SCUP in the Fall 1983 issue of Planning for Higher Education. That is the review of "Strategic Planning as Pragmatic Adaptation" by James L. Miller, Jr. The same issue contains an extensive "Strategic Planning Bibliography" compiled by Michael D. Waggoner. Primarily a review of George Keller's Academic Strategy (1983), Miller's article includes appraisal of Robert Copo's Strategic Planning, Management, and Decision Making (1981) and other applications of strategic planning to higher education.

Given the availability to this audience of Miller's excellent critique, I simply will draw on the following quotation from Miller (p. 43) toward reaching my conclusion about the uses of strategic planning:

> An explicit rejection of "rational planning models" and of many of the techniques associated with them, such as quantification, modelling, and formal planning procedures, pervades much of the strategic planning literature. In more than a few cases the rejection of rational planning takes the form of actual lists of what strategic planning is not. Indulgent readers will interpret the lists of "what strategic planning is not" as an effort to free planning from rigidity; less indulgent readers will question how decisions are to be made with any sense of their future impact through a planning process that...deprecates or rejects quantification, modelling, planning that is "done by planners," and other elements of established practice which would be hard to work without even if there is room for improvement in the ways they are done. The negative commentary often begins on a strong note of rejection and then introduces qualifications and even backtracking until one is left with the impression that the offenders have been put on probation rather than expelled.

. . . . . .

> Much of the strategic planning literature is of the "trust me" school. It assumes that those who verbalize a sensitivity to the abuse of excessive rationalism are ipso facto those who should be trusted to make judgmental decisions on other bases.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> When does a desirable degree of flexibility become an undesirable laissez-faire invitation to authoritarian or oligarchic rule[?] The issue is seldom addressed in the strategic planning literature, possibly because the movement is still in its advocacy stage and has not yet been faced with the necessity of explaining the longer term outcomes of widespread efforts at implementation. Keller is one writer who does address this issue. His advice is unequivocal: "Strategy making must be participatory, though not in a wide open way....most of the key people need to be on board the strategy train when it leaves the station....[but]...the president...is the final arbiter" (Keller, p. 149).

As an ancient practitioner dedicated to the notions that reason is a virtue, that quantification is vital to know how many of what kinds of things there are in a decision situation, and that modelling helps translate complex data into usable and relevant information, I have had visions of a strategic planner running in circles, reversing frequently if some "opportunity" passes near, and then boarding a train that jumps periodically from one set of tracks to another!

On such occasions, I reread Marvin Peterson's essay on "Analyzing Alternative Approaches to Planning" (1980). That helps me weave it all back together. When I read Robert Cope's list of "Six Techniques Necessary to Plan Strategically" I realize that we traditionalists have been doing strategic planning all along anyway! In one form or another, we have been engaging in "environmental scanning, marketing, review of missions and programs, selected group processes and cognitive skills, understanding measures of effectiveness, and adapting a planning model that integrates horizontal and vertical organization over time" (Cope, 1981, p. 3).

The strategic planning literature has evoked some vital revision and renewal of my approach to higher education planning. Adaptation to continuous change in <u>both</u> internal and external environments is more essential than ever. I expect to adapt many of the techniques and the perspective contributed by strategic planning literature to varied planning issues I confront. But I still expect to continue much of the traditional rational planning techniques and principles. I still believe in forecasting the possibilities of the <u>future</u> to help institutional officers to know where things seem to be heading and to judge what they can do <u>today</u> to improve that future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Search for Quality in the Face of Retrenchment
by Thomas R. Mason
July 1984

1A. Quality: Ratings, Rankings, and Reform

Astin, Alexander W., and Solmon, Lewis C. "A New Study of Excellence in Undergraduate Education: Departments Without Distinguished Graduate Programs" (Part One: The Quality of Undergraduate Education). Change 13:6 (September 1981a), pp. 22-28. "Are Reputation Ratings Needed to Measure Quality?" (Part Two: The Quality of Undergraduate Education). Change 13:7 (October 1981b), pp. 14-19.

Boulding, Kenneth E. "Quality Versus Equality: The Dilemma of the University." American Higher Education Toward and Uncertain Future, Volume II. Daedalus 104:1 (Winter 1975), pp. 298-303.

Boyer, Ernest L., and Kaplan, Mark. Educating for Survival. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1977.

Cole, Charles C., Jr. Improving Instruction: Issues and Alternatives for Higher Education. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 4, 1982. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1982.

Conrad, Clifton F., and Wyer, Jean C. Liberal Education in Transition. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 3, 1980. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1980.

Finn, Chester E., Jr. "The Future of Education's Liberal Consensus." Change 12:6 (September 1980), pp. 25-30.

Finn, Chester E., Jr. "Toward A New Consensus." Change 13:6 (September 1981), pp. 16-21, 60-63. (See reaction cited below, Peltason.)

Finn, Chester E., Jr. "Trying Higher Education: An Eight Count Indictment." Change 16:4 (May/June 1984), p. 28.

Gamson, Zelda F., and Associates. Liberating Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Grant, Gerald, and Riesman, David. "An Ecology of Academic Reform." American Higher Education Toward and Uncertain Future, Volume II. Daedalus 104:1 (Winter 1975), pp. 166-191.

Gross, Theodore L. "Where Have All the Flowers Gone?" Change 13:2 (March 1981), pp. 25-29, 56.

Hermanns, Harry; Teichler, Ulrich; and Wasser, Henry (editors). The Compleat University: Break from Tradition in Germany, Sweden and the USA. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing, 1983.

Jencks, Christopher, and Riesman, David. The Academic Revolution. New York: Doubleday, 1968.

Jones, Richard M., and Smith, Barbara Leigh (editors). Against the Current: Reform and Experimentation in Higher Education [The Evergreen Conference]. Cambridge: MA: Schenkman Publishing, 1984.

Kuh, George D. Indices of Quality in the Undergraduate Experience. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 4, 1981. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1981.

Kuhns, Eileen, and Martorana, S.V. (editors). Qualitative Methods for Institutional Research. New Directions for Institutional Research 34. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Lawrence, Judith K., and Green, Kenneth C. A Question of Quality: The Higher Education Ratings Game. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 5, 1980. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1980.

Lawrence, Judith K., and Solomon, Lewis C. "Reputational Ratings and Undergraduate Education Assessment" in Miller, Richard I. (editor), Institutional Assessment for Self-Improvement, New Directions for Institutional Research 29. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981, pp. 1-14.

Levine, Arthur. "Today's College Students: Going First Class on the Titanic." Change 13:2 (March 1981), pp. 16-23.

Martin, William Bryan. "Institutional Priorities," Chapter 3 in Jellema, William W. (editor), Efficient College Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972, pp, 20-30.

Martin, William Bryan. College of Character: Renewing the Purpose and Content of College Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Meyerson, Martin. "After a Decade of the Levelers in Higher Education: Reinforcing Quality While Maintaining Mass Education." American Higher Education Toward and Uncertain Future, Volume II. Daedalus 104:1 (Winter 1975), pp.

McPherson, Michael. "Quality and Competition in Public and Private Higher Education." Change 13:3 (April 1981), pp. 18-23.

Nordvall, Robert C. The Process of Change in Higher Education Institutions. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Reports No. 7, 1982. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1982.

Orr, Daniel. "An Economist Looks at College Rankings: An Anti-Benthamite View." Change 16:2 (March 1984), pp. 45-49.

Peltason, Jack W. "Federal Dollars: Providing the Margin of Quality" (Reaction to Finn, 1980) Change 13:7 (October 1981), pp. 26-27.

Riesman, David. On Higher Education: The Academic Enterprise in an Era of Rising Student Consumerism. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Rossides, Daniel W. "What is the Purpose of Education? The Worthless Debate Continues." Change 16:3 (April 1984), pp. 14-21, 44-46.

Rudolph, Frederick. "The Power of Professors: The Impact of Specialization and Professionalization on the Curriculum." Change 16:4 (May-June 1984), pp. 12-17, 41.

Troutt, William E. "Relationships between Regional Accrediting Association Standards and Educational Quality" in Miller, Richard I. (editor), Institutional Assessment for Self-Improvement, New Directions for Institutional Research 29. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981, pp. 45-59.

Vaughan, George B. "Balancing Open Access with Quality: The Community College at the Watershed." Change 16:2 (March 1984), pp. 38-44.

Webster, David S. "Advantages and Disadvantages of Methods of Assessing Quality." Change 13:7 (October 1981), pp. 20-24.

Webster, David S. "America's Highest Ranked Graduate Schools, 1925-1982." Change 15:4 (May/June 1983), pp. 14-24.

Ziegler, Jerome M. "Some Questions Before Us: Notes Toward the Future in Higher Education." American Higher Education Toward and Uncertain Future, Volume II. Daedalus 104:1 (Winter 1975), pp. 210-221.

1B. Quality: Institutional Goals and Educational Outcomes

Balderston, Frederick E. "Toward Survival, Stability, and Excellence," Chapter 11, Managing Today's University. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Banfield, Edward C. "Ends and Means in Planning" in Mailick, Sidney, and Van Ness, Edward H. (editors), Concepts and Issues in Administrative Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1962, pp. 70-80.

Fenske, Robert H. (editor). Using Goals in Research and Planning. New Directions for Institutional Research 19. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Fenske, Robert H. "Setting Institutional Goals and Objectives," Chapter 8 in Jedamus, Paul, Peterson, Marvin W., and Associates. Improving Academic Management: A Handbook of Planning and Institutional Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Graubard, Stephen R. "Thoughts on Higher Educational Purposes and Goals: A Memorandum." American Higher Education Toward and Uncertain Future, Volume I. Daedalus 103:4 (Fall 1974), pp. 1-11.

Grant, Gerald (editor). On Competence: A Critical Analysis of Competence-Based Reforms in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Gray, Robert G.; Jacobson, Edmund; Micek, Sidney S.; Patrick, Cathleen; Renkiewicz, Nancy; and Van Dusen, William. Student Outcomes Questionnaires: An Implementation Handbook. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems and The College Board, 1979.

Kaysen, Carl. "What Should Undergraduate Education Do?" American Higher Education Toward an Uncertain Future, Volume I. Daedalus 103:4 (Fall 1974), pp. 180-185.

Keimig, Ruth Talbott. Raising Academic Standards: A Guide to Learning Improvement. ASHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 4, 1983. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1983.

Lenning, Oscar T. The Outcomes Structure: An Overview and Procedures for Applying it in Postsecondary Education Institutions. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1977.

Lenning, Oscar T.; Lee, Yong S.; Micek, Sidney S.; and Service, Allan L. A Structure for the Outcomes of Postsecondary Education. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1977.

Micek, Sidney S., and Arney, William Ray. The Higher Education Outcome Measures Identification: A Descriptive Summary. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1974.

Micek, Sidney S., and Wallhaus, Robert A. An Introduction to the Identification and Uses of Higher Education Outcome Information, Technical Report No. 40. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1973.

Peterson, Richard E., and Uhl, Norman P. Institutional Goals Inventory: Comparative Data and Bibliography. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1975.

Peterson, Richard E., and Uhl, Norman P. College and University Goals: A Guide for Using the IGI. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1977.

Romney, Leonard. Measures of Institutional Goal Achievement. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1978.

Romney, Leonard C., and Micek, Sidney S. "Translating Goals into Measurable Objectives: Research Studies and Practical Procedures" in Fenske, Robert H., and Staskey, Paul J. (editors), Research and Planning for Higher Education (17th Annual Forum, Montreal, 1977). Tallahassee, FL: Association for Institutional Research, 1978, pp. 93-96.

Wallhaus, Robert A. (editor). Measuring and Increasing Academic Productivity. New Directions for Institutional Research 8. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

2A. Retrenchment: Enrollment Decline

Baldridge, J. Victor; Kemerer, Frank R.; and Green, Kenneth C. The Enrollment Crisis: Factors, Actors, and Impacts. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 3, 1982. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1982.

Breneman, David W. The Coming Enrollment Crisis: What Every Trustee Must Know. Washington: The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and College, 1982.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. More than Survival: Prospects for Higher Education in a Period of Uncertainty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Cartter, Allan M. (editor). Assuring Academic Progress Without Growth. New Directions for Institutional Research 6. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Census, U.S. Bureau of the. Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 922, Projections of Population Aged 18 through 24, 1982.

Census, U.S. Bureau of the. Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 948, Projections of the Population of Voting Age for States: November 1984, April 1984.

Census, U.S. Bureau of the. Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 952, Projections of the Population of the United States, by Age, Sex, and Race: 1983 to 2080, May 1984

Chronicle of Higher Education 28:6 (April 4, 1984), "Deluge of New Freshman Applications Surprises Many Admissions Directors."

Chronicle of Higher Education 28:13 (May 23, 1984), "2-Year Colleges Face a Decline in Enrollment."

Crossland, Fred E. "Learning to Cope with a Downward Slope." Change 12:5 (July/August 1980).

Frances, Carol. "Apocalyptic vs. Strategic Planning." Change 12:5 (July/August 1980a).

Frances, Carol. College Enrollment Trends: Testing the Conventional Wisdom Against the Facts. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1980b.

Glenny, Lyman A. "Demographic and Related Issues for Higher Education in the 1980s." Journal of Higher Education 51 (1980): 363-80.

McConnell, William R. High School Graduates: Projections for the Fifty States. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1979.

McConnell, William R., and Kaufman, Norman. High School Graduates: Projections for the Fifty States (1982-2000). Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (with Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association and the College Board), 1984.

2B. Retrenchment: Faculty, Finances, Flexibility

Balderston, Frederick E. Managing Today's University. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Bowen, Howard R. Investment in Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Bowen, Howard R. "Some Reflections on the Current Position and Future Outlook of American Higher Education" in Staskey, Paul J., Balancing Needs and Resources (18th Annual Forum, Houston, 1978). Tallahassee, FL: Association for Institutional Research, 1978, pp. 25-33.

Bowen, Howard R. "What's Ahead for Higher Education? Opportunities for Optimism." Change 16:3 (April 1984), pp. 8-13.

Breneman, David W. Internal Pricing Within the University — A Conference Report. Berkeley: Ford Foundation Program for Research in University Administration, Report P-24, 1972.

Breneman, David W., and Finn, Chester E., Jr. Public Policy and Private Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1978.

Breneman, David W., and Nelson, Susan C. Financing Community Colleges: An Economic Perspective. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1981.

Bunn, Ronald F. "Renewal Through Retrenchment: A Bridge Too Far?" Paper given at the 17th Annual Conference, Society for College and University Planning, Buffalo, N.Y., August 1, 1982.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. More Effective Use of Resources. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Caruthers, J. Kent, and Orwig, Melvin. Budgeting in Higher Education. AAHE-ERIC/ Higher Education Research Report No. 3, 1979. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

Cheit, Earl F. The New Depression in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Chronicle of Higher Education 28:18 (June 27, 1984). "AAUP Adds 3 Colleges, Removes None from Academic Freedom Censure List" and "AAUP's Leader Assays Decline in Faculty Morale, Governance."

Cooke, Alfred L. (editor). Planning Rational Retrenchment. New Directions for Institutional Research 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Finn, Chester E., Jr. Scholars, Dollars & Bureaucrats. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1978.

Firnberg, James W., and Lasher, William F. (editors). The Politics and Pragmatics of Institutional Research. New Directions for Institutional Research 38. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Flournoy, Don Michael. The Rationing of American Higher Education. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing, 1982.

Hample, Stephen R. (editor). Coping with Faculty Reduction. New Directions for Institutional Research 30. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Hendrickson, Robert M., and Barbara A. Lee. Academic Employment and Retrenchment: Judicial Review and Administrative Action. ASHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 8, 1983. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1983.

Heydinger, Richard B. Using Program Priorities to Make Retrenchment Decisions: The Case of the University of Minnesota. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, n.d. (c. 1982).

Hines, Edward R., and Hartmark, Leif S. Politics of Higher Education. AAHE-ERIC/ Higher Education Research Report No. 7, 1980. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1980.

Kaludis, George (editor). Strategies for Budgeting. New Directions for Higher Education 2. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Kauffman, Joseph F. "Some Perspective on Hard Times." Review of higher Education 6:1 (Fall 1982), pp. 69-78.

Kirschling, Wayne R. (editor). Evaluating Faculty Performance and Vitality. New Directions for Institutional Research 20. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Linck, A.J., and Heydinger, R.B. "Planning at the University of Minnesota: A Retrospective and Prospective Look." Paper prepared for the Planning Council, University of Minnesota, November 1983.

Litton, Larry H. Issues of Pricing Undergraduate Education. New Directions for Institutional Research 42. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Melchiori, Gerlinda S. Planning for Program Discontinuance: From Default to Design. AAHE-ERIC/ Higher Education Research Report No. 5, 1982. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1982.

Minnesota, University of, Budget Executive. Academic Program Priorities: The University's Choices for 1982 - 85. Report Presented by the Budget Executive to the Board of Regents, May 13, 1982.

Peterson, Marvin W. "In a Decade of Decline: The Seven R's of Planning." Change 16:4 (May-June 1984), pp.42-51.

Stampen, Jacob. The Financing of Public Higher Education. AAHE-ERIC/ Higher Education Research Report No. 9, 1980. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1980.

Wellhaus, Robert A. "Analyzing Academic Program Resource Requirements," Chapter 16 in Jedamus, Paul; Peterson, Marvin W., and Associates, Improving Academic Management: A Handbook of Planning and Institutional Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

3. Evaluation: Assessment of Performance

Austin, Ann E., and Gamson, Zelda F. Academic Workplace: New Demands, Heightened Tensions ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 10, 1983. Washington, D.C. Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1983.

Blackburn, Robert T.; O"Connell, Colman; and Pellino, Glenn. "Evaluating Faculty Performance," Chapter 23 in Jedamus, Paul; Peterson, Marvin W.; and Associates, Improving Academic Management: A Handbook of Planning and Institutional Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Bowen, Howard R. (editor). Evaluating Institutions for Accountability. New Directions for Institutional Research 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Centra, John A. "Colleagues as Raters of Classroom Instruction." Journal of Higher Education 46:327-337.

Craven, Eugene C. (editor). Academic Program Evaluation. New Directions for Institutional Research 27. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Craven, Eugene C. "Evaluating Program Performance," Chapter 22 in Jedamus, Paul; Peterson, Marvin W.; and Associates, Improving Academic Management: A Handbook of Planning and Institutional Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Cristal, Melodie E.; Firnberg, James W.; and LaCour, Marie S. "Using HEGIS Data in Institutional Comparisons." Paper presented at the Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Fort Worth, April 1984.

Doi, James I. (editor). Assessing Faculty Effort. New Directions for Institutional Research 2. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Dressel, Paul L., and Associates. Evaluation in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961.

Feasley, Charles E. Program Evaluation. AAHE-ERIC/Research Report No. 2, 1980. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1980.

Hall, Alfred E. "Starting at the Beginning — The Baccalaureate Origins of Doctorate Recipients, 1920-1980." Change 16:3 (April 1984), pp. 40-43.

Harcleroad, Fred F. Accreditation: History, Process, and Problems. AAHE-ERIC/Research Report No. 6, 1980. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1980.

Harris, Adrian H. "Apples Are Never Oranges: The Comparability Question Revisited." Paper prepared for the 18th Annual Forum, Association for Institutional Research, Houston, 1978.

Manning, Charles W., and Romney, Leonard C. Faculty Activity Analysis: Procedures Manual, Technical Report No. 44. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1974.

Mason, Thomas R. "Institutional Research," Chapter 4 in Jellema, William W. (editor), Efficient College Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Mason, Thomas R. "Assessing Faculty Productivity." Contributed paper, 21st Annual Forum, Association for Institutional Research, Minneapolis, May 1981. (ERIC No. HE 014 103.) Summary of Assessing and Increasing Faculty Productivity in the State Colleges and Universities of Colorado, Denver: Colorado Commission on Higher Education, 1979.

Millard, Richard M. "The Accrediting Association: Ensuring the Quality of Programs and Institutions. Change 15:4 (May/June 1983), pp. 32-37.

Miller, Richard I. The Assessment of College Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Miller, Richard I. (editor). Institutional Assessment for Self-Improvement, New Directions for Institutional Research 29. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Munitz, Barry. "Examining Administrative Performance," Chapter 24 in Jedamus, Paul; Peterson, Marvin W.; and Associates, Improving Academic Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Nordvall, Robert C. Evaluation and Development of Administrators. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 6, 1979. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

Rawson, Thomas M.; Hoyt, Donald P.; and Teeter Deborah J. "Identifying 'Comparable' Institutions." Research in Higher Education 18:3 (1983), pp. 299-310.

Rogers, Terry Heitz, and Gamson, Zelda F. "Evaluation as a Developmental Process: The Case of Liberal Arts Education." The Review of Higher Education (Summer 1982) 5:225-238.

Saupe, Joe L. "Assessing Program Quality" in Fincher, Cameron (editor), The Challenge and Response of Institutional Research. Athens, GA: Association for Institutional Research, 1970, pp. 9-12.

Scott, Robert A. (editor). Determining the Effectiveness of Campus Services. New Directions for Institutional Research 41. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Seldin, Peter. "Faculty Evaluation—Surveying Policy and Practices." Change 16:3 (April 1984), pp. 28-33 (summarizes Peter Seldin, Changing Faculty Evaluation Practices. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984).

Shulman, Carol Herrnstadt. Old Expectations, New Realities: The Academic Profession Revisited. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 2, 1979. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

Smith, Albert B. Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education. AAHE-ERIC/Research Report No. 8, 1976. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1976.

Wilson, Richard F. "Appraising Institutional Performance." Chapter 21 in Jedamus, Paul; Peterson, Marvin W.; and Associates. Improving Academic Management: A Handbook of Planning and Institutional Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Wilson, Richard F. "Critical Issues in Program Evaluation." The Review of Higher Education (Winter 1984) 7:143-157.

Whitman, Neal, and Elaine Weiss. Faculty Evaluation: The Use of Explicit Criteria for Promotion, Retention, and Tenure. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 2, 1982. Washington, D.C. Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1982.

4. Strategic Planning — and Other Solutions

Cope, Robert G. Strategic Policy Planning: A Guide for College and University Administrators. Littleton, CO: Ireland Educational Corporation, 1978.

Cope, Robert G. Strategic Planning, Management, and Decision Making. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 9, 1981. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1981.

Cope, Robert G. "A Contextual Model to Encompass the Strategic Planning Concept: Introducing a Newer Paradigm." Paper prepared for the 19th Annual Conference, Society for College and University Planning, Boston, July 1984.

DiBecco, Thomas V. "Abreast of Biz School Buzzwords." The Wall Street Journal 64:158 (May 29, 1984).

Dresch, Stephen P. "A Critique of Planning Models for Postsecondary Education: Current Feasibility, Potential Relevance, and a Prospectus for Further Research." Journal of Higher Education 46:3 (May/June 1975), pp. 245-286.

Drucker, Peter. Managing in Turbulent Times. New York: Harper and Row, 1980.

Ferkniss, Victor. "The Future: Not Quite So Easy As It Looked." World Future Society Bulletin 18:3 (May-June 1984), pp. 10-14.

Fincher, Cameron. "What Is Strategic Planning?" (AIR Between Forums). Research in Higher Education 16 (1982), pp.373-376.

Grabowski, Stanley M. Marketing in Higher Education. AAHE-ERIC/ Higher Education Research Report No. 5, 1981. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1981.

Heydinger, Richard B. (editor). Academic Planning for the 1980s. New Directions for Institutional Research 28. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Hipps, G. Melvin (editor). Effective Planned Change Strategies. New Directions for Institutional Research 33. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Issues for the Eighties," in Paul J. Staskey (editor), Issues for the Eighties (19th Annual Forum, San Diego, 1979). Tallahassee, FL: Association for Institutional Research, 1979, pp. 1-13.

Keller, George. Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Lucas, John A. Developing a Total Marketing Plan. New Directions for Institutional Research 21. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Mack, Ruth P. Planning on Uncertainty: Decision Making in Business and Government Administration. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1971.

Mason, Thomas R. (editor). Assessing Computer-Based Systems Models. New Directions for Institutional Research 9. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Miller, James L., Jr. "Strategic Planning as Pragmatic Adaptation." Planning for Higher Education 21: (Fall 1983), pp. 41-47.

Morrison, James L.; Renfro, William L.; and Boucher, Wayne I. (editors). Applying Methods and Techniques of Futures Research. New Directions for Institutional Research 39. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Peterson, Marvin W. "Analyzing Alternative Approaches to Planning," Chapter 7 in Jedamus, Paul; Peterson, Marvin W., and Associates, Improving Academic Management: A Handbook of Planning and Institutional Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Richards, Michael D., and Sherratt, Gerald R. Institutional Advancement Strategies in Hard Times. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 2, 1981. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1981.

So, Frank S. "Strategic Planning: Reinventing the Wheel?" Planning 50:2 (February 1984), pp. 16-21. Summarized in Future Survey 6:4 (April 1984), Item 84-283, p. 14.

Uhl, Norman P. Using Research for Strategic Planning. New Directions for Institutional Research 37. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Waggoner, Michael E. "A Strategic Planning Bibliography." Planning for Higher Education 21:1 (Fall 1983), pp. 48-50.